

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-7 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-7 and the specification are amended and formal drawings are submitted. Independent claim 1 is amended to even further distinguish over the applied reference as well as to obviate the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 2-7 are amended to maintain consistency with independent claim 1 and to obviate rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The specification is amended to overcome the objections asserted by the Office Action. Support for the claim amendments can be found, for example, at page 9, line 4 through page 10, line 6; at page 12, line 7 through page 13, line 9; at page 14, lines 15-21; and at page 20, lines 3-19; and in Fig. 4. No new matter is added.

**I. Objection to the Drawings**

Applicant submits Formal Drawings to overcome the objection to the drawings explained in paragraph 1 of the Office Action. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

**II. Objections to the Specification**

Applicant amends the specification to remove all language referring the specific claims, as requested by the Examiner. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

**III. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The Office Action alleges that claims 1-7 fail to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant amends claims 1-7 to address the issues raised by the Office Action. However, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office Action's assertion that "'the rimless frame' (claim 2, line 13)" (Office Action, paragraph 4.a.iii) and "'the monitoring step' (claim 6, line 3)" (Office Action, paragraph 4.a.ix) lack antecedent basis. In particular, claim 2, line 9 recites "a rimless frame," thus providing antecedent basis for "the rimless frame."

Furthermore, claim 4 recites "a monitoring step;" claim 6 depends from claim 4, and therefore antecedent basis is provided for "the monitoring step" in claim 6. Accordingly, Applicant has not amended these terms in the claims. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

**IV. Claims 1-7 Are Patentable Over Siders et al.**

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Siders et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7, 086,928) (Siders). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Siders fails to disclose or render obvious the combination of features recited by independent claim 1. In particular, Siders fails to disclose or render obvious a lens edging step for bevel-edging the spectacle lens based on the lens edge shape data of the spectacle frame, a predetermined edging condition selected from a plurality of edging conditions, and a circumference correction value that is stored for every edging condition and that is used for obtaining a lens edge circumference of the spectacle frame as a circumference of the spectacle lens, every time bevel-edging order of the spectacle lens occurs, and a correcting step of correcting the circumference correction value so as to keep the circumferential difference within a prescribed range, as recited by independent claim 1. The Office Action acknowledges that Siders fails to disclose a circumference calculating step and a correcting step; however, Siders further fails to disclose or render obvious the claimed circumference correction value.

The current claims provide a method in which a properly finished circumference is provided by controlling the circumferential difference between the lens edge circumference of the spectacle frame and the finished circumference so that it is maintained within a prescribed range. Siders fails to disclose or render obvious the claimed combination of features that achieve this result. Independent claim 1 recites a circumference correction value that is stored for every edging condition. Thus, it is possible to provide a lens in which the circumferential difference between the lens edge and the frame is within a prescribed range.

Siders, on the other hand, merely cuts the lens and inspects the lens, placing it into the frame for a final inspection. See Figs. 1-3 of Siders. Siders does not correct the lens. The Office Action alleges that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to change the edging conditions if the lens fails to fit the frame. Applicant submits that there was no rationale that would make it obvious for one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to, not only modify, but use a circumference correction value with the disclosure of Siders. Even if one wanted to further correct/cut the lens, there is no teaching in Siders, or in the prior art, to perform the steps of Applicant's independent claim 1. Siders fails to disclose or render obvious a lens edging step for bevel-edging the spectacle lens based on the lens edge shape data of the spectacle frame, a predetermined edging condition selected from a plurality of edging conditions, and a circumference correction value that is stored for every edging condition and that is used for obtaining a lens edge circumference of the spectacle frame as a circumference of the spectacle lens, every time bevel-edging order of the spectacle lens occurs, and a correcting step of correcting the circumference correction value so as to keep the circumferential difference within a prescribed range, as recited by independent claim 1.

Thus, claim 1 is patentable over Siders. Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1, and therefore also are patentable over Siders for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

**V. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of all pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Mario A. Costantino  
Registration No. 33,565

JAO:MAC/mem

Attachment:

Petition for Extension of Time  
Formal Drawings

Date: July 3, 2008

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------